REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 8, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-30, 32-37, 39, 45, 47-55 and 57-60 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-60 stand rejected. Claim 6, 13, 20, 31, 38, 46, 56 has been canceled.

The rejection of Claims 1-25 and 41-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being unpatentable because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts at pages 2-4 of the Office Action that the claims appear "to be directed to nothing more than a series of steps including calculating, determining, and allowing an order change without any tangible result." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in light of the amended claims. Specifically, independent Claims 1, 15, 26, 41 and 51 have been amended to include, *inter alia*, the step of "updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date." Applicants respectfully submit that updating an electronic manifest is a tangible result.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 101 rejection of Claims 1-25 and 41-60.

The rejection of Claims 1, 15, 26, 40, 41 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges at pages 4-5 of the Office Action that the limitation "order change" as recited is "vague and indefinite. It is unclear to the Examiner if 'an order change' refers to the previously mentioned order *or* a new/different order." (Emphasis in original). Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. Applicants respectfully submit that numerous

examples of an "order change" are provided throughout Applicants' specification, for example, at Paragraph [0036] and Table 4. Nevertheless, in order to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 15, 26, 40, 41 and 51 to require the limitation of "allowing an order change *that affects the delivery date of the order . . .*" (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection of Claims 1, 15, 26, 40, 41 and 51.

The rejection of Claims 1-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT International Application Pub. No. WO 01/13261 to Juedes et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Juedes") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,915 to Kirsch (hereinafter referred to as "Kirsch") and U.S. Patent No. 6,876,977 to Marks (hereinafter referred to as "Marks") is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejection based on Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks is not a proper Section 103 rejection. Juedes was filed on August 17, 2000, which is after the December 30, 1999 filing date of the present patent application. Juedes does claim priority to Provisional Patent Application No. 60/149,501, which was filed on August 17, 1999. However, the Examiner does not cite to or rely on the disclosure of Provisional Application No. 60/149,501. Rather, the Examiner relies exclusively on the disclosure of Juedes. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure included within Juedes may not be supported by the disclosure included within Provisional Application No. 60/149,501.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Juedes is not prior art to the present patent application because it was not filed prior to the present patent application. Moreover, although Provisional Application 60/149,501 was filed before the present patent application, it was not relied on by the Examiner in the Office Action and its disclosure may be different from Juedes.

For at least this reason, Applicants request withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection to Claims 1-60.

Juedes describes a system 100 that fulfills orders placed by a customer 104 from a provider 106 of a product over the Internet 102. The provider sends the order information to an e-commerce hub 112, which arranges for transportation and delivery of the product. The hub software automatically selects, based on the order information and predetermined stored criteria, which of a plurality of predetermined carriers should be used to transport the product from the provider to the customer. Juedes also describes on pages 21-22 an "order timeline feasibility model" that "compares the consumer placed order date plus any extended number of days plus twenty five days, with the actual date that the order is available for pickup. The order status is changed to 'reject' if the order timeline feasibility model indicates that the consumer placed order date, plus the predetermined extended number of days, plus twenty-five days, exceeds the available date for pickup....The timeline feasibility module 424 *is particularly useful in making sure that all maximum delivery periods established by governmental regulation are met.* For example, laws or regulations may mandate that goods ordered by a credit card must be received by a consumer within 30 days of the date of order. *For transactions which are not affected by delivery-period regulations, the timeline feasibility module 424 may be omitted.*" (Emphasis added).

Moreover, Figure 13 in Juedes specifically provides for those carrier partners who carry the first segment (S_1) and have a less-than-truckload (LTL), which allows several loads to be loaded onto a single semitrailer. If the carrier is unable to perform the service as specified, the carrier sends an exception code. The feasibility of the order pickup timeline is determined by running the "timeline feasibility module" again to verify that the pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days).

Notably, Juedes does not describe or suggest allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by an authorized user.

Kirsch describes an internet computer system 10 wherein a conventional client computer 12 is connected to the Internet 14 by an Internet Service Provider (ISP) and a server computer system 16 is connected to the Internet by an ISP. The server computer, which is controlled by a local console 18, is configured to execute a Web server application. The client computer is configured to request a web page and permit the client to purchase items from the web page. After a client has accepted a purchase, an optional client PIN is provided that may be checked and verified against the client record. Additional levels of authentication and security may be added, however, these levels include usage of an optional PIN, restrictions on shipping destinations, and email confirmation of orders. Further, these levels are limited to "a server process specific to the acceptance phase of initial purchase acceptance and confirmation."

Marks describes a computer-implemented method for conducting business-to-business electronic commerce over the Internet. The method includes enabling two or more remote users to simultaneously access a shopping basket. Each of the users is permitted to simultaneously view the status of the shopping basket and sequentially affect the state of the shopping basket. The ability to affect the state of the basket also includes providing users with various selected levels of access to the basket so that unauthorized purchases may be prevented.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejection is not a proper rejection because the cited art does not provide some teaching, suggestion, or incentive that supports combining the cited art. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. In contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, because there is no teaching, motivation, or suggestion to combine the references. The Examiner has only provided the conclusory statements that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Juedes et al as taught by

Kirsch and Marks, for the purpose of providing a method of efficiently performing secure purchase transactions over the Internet. Applicants traverse this assertion. It would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify or combine Juedes, which describes a system for arranging a plurality of carrier partners to deliver a product within a certain timeline, with the other references. For example, Marks simply describes a method that provides varying levels of access to an online shopping basket.

Since there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103 rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, and to the extent understood, none of Juedes, Kirsch and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests the claimed invention. Specifically, Claim 1 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system, the order being delivered from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, the method including "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date and a respective buyer's address; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order based on the first potential arrival date; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the

logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule as recited in Claim 1. Specifically, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that includes allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code. Further, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that repeats the steps for determining the delivery date to determine a new delivery date if the order change is allowed.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein if a carrier is unable to perform a service within a specified time period, a "time feasibility module" is run again to verify that a pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days). Moreover, Juedes does not describe allowing a change to an order status where allowance of the change is due to a user's security level, the type of order change, and who or what entity the user is acting as. Kirsch describes using an optional PIN to verify the client user, but does not describe allowing an order change to be made wherein allowance is based on a number of factors. Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to an online shopping basket.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claims 6 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 15 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server, the order being delivered from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, the method including "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date and a respective buyer's address; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order within a set of potential delivery dates based on the first potential arrival date and a first date the respective delivery agent is prepared to ship the order; (3) selecting an actual delivery date from the set of potential delivery dates; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the actual delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the actual delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new actual delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule as recited in Claim 15. Specifically, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that includes allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the

respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code. Further, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that repeats the steps for determining the delivery date to determine a new delivery date if the order change is allowed.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein if a carrier is unable to perform a service within a specified time period, a "time feasibility module" is run again to verify that a pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days). Moreover, Juedes does not describe allowing a change to an order status where allowance of the change is due to a user's security level, the type of order change, and who or what entity the user is acting as. Kirsch describes using an optional PIN to verify the client user, but does not describe allowing an order change to be made wherein allowance is based on a number of factors. Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to an online shopping basket.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 15 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 20 has been canceled. Claims 16-19 and 21-25 depend from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-19 and 21-25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 16-19 and 21-25 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 26 recites a computer program storage medium readable by a computer system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for managing deliveries of a goods delivery system, the system employed to deliver an order from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the delivery agent to a respective buyer, the computer process including the steps of "(1) determining a first potential arrival date of the order to the respective delivery agent's location, based on an order request date and the respective buyer's address; (2) determining an ability of the

respective delivery agent to ship the order based on the first potential arrival date; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a computer program storage medium readable by a computer system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for managing deliveries of a goods delivery system as recited in Claim 26. Specifically, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a computer process that includes allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code. Further, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a computer process that repeats the steps for determining the delivery date to determine a new delivery date if the order change is allowed.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein if a carrier is unable to perform a service within a specified time period, a "time

feasibility module" is run again to verify that a pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days). Moreover, Juedes does not describe allowing a change to an order status where allowance of the change is due to a user's security level, the type of order change, and who or what entity the user is acting as. Kirsch describes using an optional PIN to verify the client user, but does not describe allowing an order change to be made wherein allowance is based on a number of factors. Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to an online shopping basket.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 26 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claims 31 and 38 have been canceled. Claims 27-30, 32-37, and 39 depend from independent Claim 26. When the recitations of Claims 27-30, 32-37, and 39 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 26, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 27-30, 32-37, and 39 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 40 recites an apparatus for managing the delivery of an order from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the delivery agent to a respective buyer, the apparatus including a "means for determining a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location, based on an order request date and the respective buyer's address; means for determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order based on the first potential arrival date; means for determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the order to the respective buyer's address; means for updating an electronic manifest indicating an order ship date and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and means for allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the delivery agent, the buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security

code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, said apparatus determines a new delivery date and updates the electronic manifest."

None of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests an apparatus for managing the delivery of an order as recited in Claim 40. Specifically, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests an apparatus including a means for allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code. Further, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests an apparatus with a means for repeating the steps that determine the delivery date to determine a new delivery date if the order change is allowed.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein if a carrier is unable to perform a service within a specified time period, a "time feasibility module" is run again to verify that a pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days). Moreover, Juedes does not describe allowing a change to an order status where allowance of the change is due to a user's security level, the type of order change, and who or what entity the user is acting as. Kirsch describes using an optional PIN to verify the client user, but does not describe allowing an order change to be made wherein allowance is based on a number of factors. Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to an online shopping basket.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 40 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 41 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system, the order

being delivered from at least two suppliers to a respective delivery agent, and from the delivery agent to a respective buyer, the method including the steps of "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the multiple brand order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date and a respective buyer's address; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the multiple brand order from the at least two suppliers based on the first potential arrival date; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the multiple brand order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the multiple brand order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the multiple brand order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least two suppliers, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, one of the at least two suppliers, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order as recited in Claim 41. Specifically, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that includes allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code. Further, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that repeats the steps for determining the delivery date to determine a new delivery date if the order change is allowed.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein if a carrier is unable to perform a service within a specified time period, a "time feasibility module" is run again to verify that a pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days). Moreover, Juedes does not describe allowing a change to an order status where allowance of the change is due to a user's security level, the type of order change, and who or what entity the user is acting as. Kirsch describes using an optional PIN to verify the client user, but does not describe allowing an order change to be made wherein allowance is based on a number of factors. Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to an online shopping basket.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 41 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 46 has been canceled. Claims 42-45 and 47-50 depend from independent Claim 41. When the recitations of Claims 42-45 and 47-50 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 41, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 42-45 and 47-50 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 51 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system, the order being delivered from at least two suppliers to a respective delivery agent, and from the delivery agent to a buyer, the method including the steps of "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the multiple brand order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date and a respective buyer's address; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the multiple brand order from the at least two suppliers based on the first potential arrival date; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the multiple brand order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the multiple brand order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the multiple brand order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective

delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least two suppliers, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, one of the at least two suppliers, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order as recited in Claim 51. Specifically, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that includes allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code. Further, none of Juedes, Kirsch, and Marks, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method that repeats the steps for determining the delivery date to determine a new delivery date if the order change is allowed.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein if a carrier is unable to perform a service within a specified time period, a "time feasibility module" is run again to verify that a pickup will be made within a certain number of days (e.g., 28 days). Moreover, Juedes does not describe allowing a change to an order status where allowance of the change is due to a user's security level, the type of order change, and who or what entity the user is acting as. Kirsch describes using an optional PIN to verify the client user, but does not describe allowing an order change to be made wherein allowance is based on a number of factors. Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to an online shopping basket.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 51 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch and Marks.

Claim 56 has been canceled. Claims 52-55 and 57-60 depend from independent Claim 51. When the recitations of Claims 52-55 and 57-60 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 51, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 52-55 and 57-60 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kirsch.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-60 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070